## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are currently pending in the patent application. The Examiner has rejected all of Claims 1-25 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Nguyen.

The Nguyen patent is directed to electronic commerce, providing a payment architecture and method whereby purchase requests are transmitted from a customer computer system to a merchant computer system, from the merchant computer system to a gateway computer system, and from the gateway computer system to a host legacy system which provides payment authorization. The cited passages of the Nguyen patent have been reviewed as applied by the Examiner to the claim language. Based on that review, Applicants respectfully conclude that the Nguyen patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

With specific reference to the language of the independent claims, representatively Claim 1, the Examiner has cited the teachings found at Col. 16, lines 2-38 against the claim preamble language reciting the data message to be transcoded, to produce a transcoded message for transmission to a destination device, comprising a plurality of data fields and an authentication code, the data message being received from a source device wherein said data fields have

CH919990028                    -13-

been coded in accordance with a first coding system, whereby respective data field codes are generated for said data fields and a message code is derived from said data field codes, and wherein said message code has been coded in accordance with a second coding system to generate said authentication code.    The cited teachings describe calculating a "message digest" which is a fixed length result generated when a variable length message is fed into a one-way hashing function.    The message digest is then encrypted using a private key to form a digital signature. Applicants respectfully assert that hashing a variable length message to a fixed length result and encrypting the result does not anticipate the claim language.    What is set forth in the claim language is that data fields have been coded by a first coding system to generate data field codes and a message code which is derived from the data field codes.    The Nguyen patent does not teach that data field codes are generated for data fields.    Further, Nguyen does not teach or suggest that data field codes be used to derive a message code.

Applicants further assert that the cited passage from Col. 17, lines 20-38 does not provide teachings which anticipate the claim language which states that the message code is coded using a second coding system to generate an

CH919990028                      -14-

authentication code. The cited passage details decrypting a received communication, but does not teach or suggest using a second coding system to generate an authentication code from a message code, which message code has been derived from data field codes. Nguyen is decrypting a request message in order to process the request. Decrypting cannot be said to anticipate transcoding.

Applicants further assert that the claim step of determining for each data field of the received data message whether to maintain, modify or omit that field when transcoding is not anticipated by the teachings found from Col. 42, lines 10-19 of the Nguyen patent. The cited passage describes the message flow whereby a merchant receives a sales order, passes the order via the GUI to an authorizer, and then ultimately transmits the result. There is nothing in the cited passage which teaches or suggests that a determination is being made, at all, let alone a determination as to whether to include or omit data from a original message which is being transcoded.

With respect to the claim language reciting the step of for a field to be maintained, maintaining that field in said transcoded message, the Examiner has cited Col. 46, lines 52-63. The cited teachings list code for initializing, executing, and shutting down a transaction for a test

CH919990028                    -15-

transaction. There is nothing in the listed code which teaches or suggests maintaining data fields when transcoding a data message.

With regard to the claim step of, for a field to be omitted, coding the field in accordance with said first coding system to generate an omitted field code dependent upon the data field code for that field, and replacing that field by said omitted field code in the transcoded message, the Examiner has cited the listed code found at Col. 45, lines 4-17. The cited code shows voiding a transaction, which is neither the same as or suggestive of deciding whether to omit data fields when transcoding a data message.

With regard to the claim step of, for a field to be modified, coding that field in accordance with the first coding system to generate a modified field code dependent upon the data field code for that field, and replacing that field by a modified field, comprising modified data and modified field code, in the transcoded message, the Examiner cited Col. 44, line 58 through Col.45, line 3. The cited passage lists code for adjusting the transaction; which, as described at Col. 27, line 15-16, refers to an adjustment which "[c]orrects the amount of a previously completed transaction." Clearly such is not the same as or suggestive of modifying data fields as claimed.

CH919990028               -16-

Finally, with regard to the claimed step of including said authentication code in the transcoded message, the Examiner has cited Col. 18, lines 3-11. Applicants respectfully assert that, while Nguyen does include an authorization response, such is not the same as or suggestive of the including an authentication code which is generated by coding a message code, derived from data field codes, using a second coding system, as is claimed.

It is well established under U. S. Patent Law that, for a reference to anticipate claim language under 35 USC 102, that reference must teach each and every claim feature. Since the Nguyen patent does not teach the steps or means as set forth in the independent claims, it cannot be maintained that Nguyen anticipates the invention as set forth in the independent claims, Claims 1, 8, 12, and 24, or the claims which depend therefrom and add further limitations thereto.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully reconsideration of the rejections, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
S. Hild, et al

By:   *Anne Vachon Dougherty*
Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910

CH919990028                              -17-